REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Status of Claims

Claims 1-14 are pending. Claims 1, 3 and 9 are currently amended.

Formal Matters

Applicant thanks the Examiner for previously accepting the drawing and acknowledging that certified copies of the priority document have been received.

Rejection under 35 USC § 112

Claims 1 and 9 are amended to overcome the rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 1-2 under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Theimer (US 6519241B1) in view of Hauduc (US 6993568 B1)

Theimer and Hauduc, alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest the claimed embodiments.

Theimer discloses a mobile telephone containing a web server which makes available specific information via an interface to the internet (see paragraph 1, lines 34-40). The web server contained in the mobile telephone can be coupled to an external client, which can be designated as an authorized browser (col 2, lines 40-49). The web server and web browser are connected via a CGI (see col 4, lines 14-26). According to Fig 1 and col. 3, lines 26-48, a mobile phone can perform data communication in connection with a service provider 4 and an authenticated browser 5 by a structure in which a web server 2 included in the mobile phone is combined with the service provider 4 and the authenticated browser 5 located outside via an air interface 3, and the mobile phone can transmit an inquiry of a web browser 6 included in the mobile phone to outside or receives an inquiry from outside by using data communication through the web server 2.

Theimer fails to disclose *an embedded web server for displaying a homepage of the mobile telephone on a web browser when linked to the mobile telephone through the web browser including in a telecommunication system and driving a CGI/ASP program to generate a command for communication between the mobile phone and a telecommunication system using the web browser,* as claimed in claim 1.

According to col 4, lines 16-26 of Theimer, all other servers included in the mobile phone are connected to a web server included in the mobile phone by a CGI interface. Theimer fails to disclose *a CGI/ASP program of server driven by the embedded web server to generate a command to enable communication between the mobile telephone and the telecommunication system using the web browser, and to transmit a message confirming that data updated in the web browser has been updated in the mobile telephone to the web browser*, as claimed in claim 1.

Hauduc fails to make up for Theimer's deficiencies. Hauduc teaches a system for providing language localization for server-based applications with scripts for providing the content of a web application in different languages with language pack software modules maintained at the server (see col 2, lines 35-38).

Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable.

Claim 2 is allowable at least because it depends from allowable base claim 1.

Rejection of claims 3-14 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theimer and Haduc, and further in view of Shi (US 7,032,003 B1)

Claims 3 and 9 are allowable at least for reasons similar to claim 1.

Shi fails to make up for Theimer's and Haduc's deficiencies.

Claims 4-8 and 10-14 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable base claims 3 and 9, respectively.

Conclusion

In view of the above, it is believed that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 10, 2008

Gautam Sain
Reg. No. 57,805

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.
1300 19th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036-2680
Main: (202) 659-9076